



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/878,327	06/12/2001	Rui Zhou	839-1013	2117

30024 7590 04/21/2005
NIXON & VANDERHYE P.C./G.E.
1100 N. GLEBE RD.
SUITE 800
ARLINGTON, VA 22201

EXAMINER

EDELMAN, BRADLEY E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2153

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/878,327

Applicant(s)

ZHOU ET AL.

Examiner

Bradley Edelman

Art Unit

2153

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-15 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 June 2001 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____



DETAILED ACTION

This Office action is in response to Applicant's amendments and request for reconsideration filed on February 7, 2005. Claims 1-15 are presented for examination.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

1. Claims 1, 2, 4, 7, 8, 10, and 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by <http://www.opengroup.org/security/sso> (entitled "Single Sign-On," hereinafter referred to as "Opengroup," and last updated on May 5, 1999; including sub-pages http://www.opengroup.org/security/sso/sso_intro.htm, hereinafter referred to as "Intro," and http://www.opengroup.org/security/sso/sso_scope.htm, hereinafter referred to as "Scope").

In considering claim 1, Opengroup discloses a collaboration control system for managing use of a plurality of resources (Opengroup, p. 1, ¶ 1), comprising:

A user information collection routine for collecting user account information for a user using the resources and creating an LDAP user account entry (Opengroup, p. 1, ¶ 2 describing LDAP; Intro, p. 2, Figure and last paragraph – p. 3, ¶ 1); and

A mirror routine for automatically generating mirror persons from the LDAP user account entry and maintaining the mirror persons within the resources to identify the

Art Unit: 2153

user across the resources (Intro, p. 3, bullet 2, wherein upon sign-on, a mirror person is generated and sent to the resource; and wherein the resources each store the user's "secondary" sign-on data).

Note that the recitation of the intended use of the claimed invention for a "collaboration control" system has not been given any patentable weight because it merely describes an intended use for the routine described in the body of the claim. A preamble is generally not accorded any patentable weight where it merely recites the purpose of a process or the intended use of a structure, and where the body of the claim does not depend on the preamble for completeness but, instead, the process steps or structural limitations are able to stand alone. See *In re Hirao*, 535 F.2d 67, 190 USPQ 15 (CCPA 1976) and *Kropa v. Robie*, 187 F.2d 150, 152, 88 USPQ 478, 481 (CCPA 1951). Here, the body of the claim makes no reference to collaboration control and thus does not depend on the preamble for completeness.

In considering claim 2, Opengroup further discloses that the user information comprises a user name and password (Intro, p. 3, bullet 2, "user identification and user credential information").

In considering claim 4, Opengroup further discloses a profile management routine for updating the information in the user account entry (Scope, p. 1, bullet 5, "change of user controlled authentication information shall be supported"; see also

Art Unit: 2153

"User Account Management Interface" describing updating information in user accounts).

Claims 7, 8, and 10 describe a method for performing the same steps as respective claims 1, 2, and 4 and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

Claims 13 and 14 describe a computer-readable medium for performing the same steps as respective claims 1 and 4 and are thus rejected for the same reasons.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 5, 11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Opengroup, in view of what is well known in the art.

In considering claims 5, 11, and 15, although the system taught by Win discloses substantial features of the claimed invention, it does not disclose steps for sending an electronic mail message to the user, wherein the electronic mail message contains a user password. Nonetheless, Examiner takes Official notice that such a feature in secure online systems is well known (i.e. it is well known for systems that provide authenticated access to information, such as e-mail systems, to include a feature of e-

Art Unit: 2153

mailing the user's password to the user in case the user forgets his or her password).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to include such a feature in the system taught by Win, so that if a user forgets his or her password, he or she can find out what it is in order to access the user's account.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 3, 6, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Opengroup, in view of Win et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,453,353, hereinafter "Win").

In considering claim 3 and 9, Win remains silent regarding what type of resources are being accessed and therefore does not disclose that the resources comprise databases. Nonetheless, it is well known to use single sign on systems to provide access to database resources, as evidenced by Win. In a similar art, Win discloses a single sign on system for providing clients access to resources (Abstract), wherein the resources comprise databases (col. 5, lines 19-20, "examples of resources include... a Web-enabled database"). Given this teaching, it would have been obvious to use the Opengroup authentication system for the database resources taught by Win

Art Unit: 2153

because databases often include confidential information and thus should not be accessed without proper authentication.

In considering claims 6 and 12, Win further discloses that the resources are Internet-accessible ("Web-enabled"). It would have been obvious to use the Opengroup system for Web-enabled computers and systems so that it could be used world-wide rather than be confined to a local area network or other small-scale network.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. Notably, Examiner agrees that the Win system does not clearly disclose the claimed "mirror persons" as described in Applicant's specification and as argued in Applicant's remarks. Nonetheless, the Opengroup reference relied on for the present claim rejections clearly discloses these features. Opengroup describes a system where a single sign on LDAP directory stores numerous "persons" and wherein individual resources also store those same "persons," which thus constitute "mirror persons." Thus, Examiner has applied the Opengroup reference in rejecting the claims. As a result, this Office action is non-final.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2153

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Bradley Edelman whose telephone number is 571-272-3953. The examiner can normally be reached from 9 a.m. to 5 p.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Glen Burgess can be reached at 571-272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Bradley Edelman".

BE

April 18, 2005